09/836,164

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 21-28 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 25-28 are added, above, to further define the invention, and an excess claim fee payment is provided herewith for the excessive number of claims. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 19 and 21 stand objected to upon informalities. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 21-24 stand rejected on prior art grounds. In addition, the Abstract is objected to. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

I.   The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Kawakami et al. (US Patent No. 5,062,054) hereinafter "Kawakami". Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

A.   The Rejection Based on Kawakami et al.

An important difference between the claimed invention and Kawakami lies in the distinction between possible errors and true errors. Independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 define "checking whether said possible error rectangle is a true error." Kawakami only determines possible errors. The claimed invention goes further and determines which possible errors are true errors.

The Office Action states that Kawakami discloses this feature in column 6, lines 17-46. However, Kawakami's spacing check unit accomplishes the determination of whether a possible error exists by determining whether or not the condition "Free" is met. Determining whether or not the condition "Free" is met only determines whether rectangles overlap and does not determine if a possible error rectangle is a true error.

A possible error indicates that two adjacent rectangles on the same layer are located such that the distance between the two rectangles is less than the minimum

9

09/836,164

distance allowed. This says nothing about what other shapes might exist in the area between the two adjacent rectangles. Kawakami only determines that there might be a vacant area between the pairs of adjacent rectangles identified by the adjacent rectangle search unit. Neither the adjacent rectangle search unit (34) nor the spacing check unit (36) examine the area between the two rectangles. There could easily be metal existent between the two adjacent rectangles, and Kawakami's algorithm would perform no differently. Only the claimed invention goes further and checks what is in the area between the two adjacent rectangles or what is along the edges of this area.

Consider an example where all rectangles are on the same layer and have the same potential number. Assume the distance between two rectangles is less than the minimum space allowed. These two rectangles would not meet Kawakami's condition 'Free'. As such, the error data output unit (71) of Kawakami would indicate an error. Regardless of what metal exists already in the area between the two adjacent rectangles, Kawakami is going to insert new metal covering the area between the two rectangles. The Kawakami approach then merges all of the rectangle shapes together. So, if metal really existed in the area between the two rectangles prior to the addition of new metal, Kawakami would simply add more metal, which could alter circuit performance dramatically. Kawakami does nothing to ensure a potential spacing error is a true spacing error. In today's modern technologies, where accurate wire delay is vital, Kawakami's approach is no longer a viable solution. One can no longer add metal without careful consideration. Instead, prior to the invention, it was necessary to flag the notches and slits as errors to be examined by the physical designer rather than filling them with metal.

To the contrary, the invention creates a "possible error rectangle" and checks whether this "possible error rectangle" is actually a "true error." These concepts are not taught or suggested by Kawakami principally because Kawakami simply identifies an error if rectangle A overlaps rectangle B, and does not go further to perform any processing on the claimed "possible error rectangle". Applicants' Figure 2 illustrates two metal shapes M1 and M2 and their respective minimum spacing rectangles S1 and S2. When one metal shape falls within the minimum spacing rectangle of another metal shape, as shown in Figure 2, the invention compares the shortest distance between the

10

09/836,164

metal shapes to the spacing requirement for the metal shapes and, if the shortest distance is less than the required distanced, the invention identifies a possible spacing error and forms a possible error rectangle P1, as illustrated in Figure 3. To the contrary, at this point, Kawakami classifies any overlap as an error and does not perform any further analysis.

The invention continues on and, once all possible error rectangles have been determined and a list of possible spacing errors created, the claimed invention seeks to eliminate possible error rectangles from the possible error list. The invention classifies each spacing error as non-diagonal or diagonal. A possible diagonal spacing error P1 is illustrated in Figure 4 between metal shapes M1 and M2. Figure 4 also illustrates a possible non-diagonal (e.g., a horizontal or vertical) error P2.

The invention determines whether a non-diagonal possible spacing error constitutes an actual spacing error by examining if the possible error rectangle is covered by other metal. If the non-diagonal possible spacing rectangle is entirely covered by another conductor (e.g., other metal), no error exists, and the invention removes the possible spacing error rectangle from the possible error list. For example, as illustrated in Figure 5, metal shape M3 completely covers possible error P1. Therefore, since no actual space exists between metal shapes M1 and M2 , the possible error rectangle P1 illustrated in Figure 5 is not a true spacing error and is properly removed from the possible error list.

Thus, the claimed invention includes a process of "identifying a possible error rectangle when a first conductor rectangle of said plurality of conductor rectangles occupies a portion of a minimum spacing rectangle of a second conductor rectangle of said conductor rectangles", as defined by independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19. This is as far as the process in Kawakami proceeds. However, the claimed invention goes beyond finding possible error rectangles and, instead includes a process of "checking whether said possible error rectangle is a true error", as also defined by independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19. Therefore, the claimed invention clearly goes beyond the teaching in Kawakami and provides an additional process which checks whether the possible errors are actually true errors before performing any corrective action. This allows the invention to reduce the number of unnecessary corrections that are made with conventional systems such as the one in Kawakami.

11

09/836,164

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are not taught or suggested by Kawakami and are patentable over Kawakami. Further, dependent claims 3-6, 9-12, 15-18, and 21-24 are similarly patentable over Kawakami, not only by virtue of their dependency from a patentable independent claim, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II.   Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the objections to the Abstract and claims, the Abstract and claims have been amended, above, to overcome these objections. More specifically, the Abstract has been rewritten in narrative form and the various claims have been amended to include the phrase "plurality of" where indicated in the Office Action. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the specification and claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 21-28, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

12

09/836,164

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/18/03

Frederick W. Gibb, III
Reg. No. 37,629

McGinn & Gibb, P.L.L.C.
2568-A Riva Road
Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
(301) 261-8071
Customer Number: 29154

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 1 8 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

13